



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a correspondence for a very long time afterwards ; also with M. La Grange, M. Chézy, and others. As early as the year 1826, Mr. Haughton had collected materials for the compilation of a Persian Grammar and Dictionary, but was compelled to abandon the project from a threatening of paralysis of the nerve of the left eye. He was appointed Professor of Oriental languages at Addiscombe, in 1820, where he was much beloved and respected. In the midst of his labours, in 1851, he was afflicted with loss of sight. The most celebrated oculists were consulted, and pronounced that the malady arose from over-work, and that the evil could only be mitigated by perfect rest. Mr. Haughton immediately sent in his resignation to the Court of Directors, but, from an over-sensitive regard to what he considered his duty, remained at his post until a suitable successor could be found. This delay was most unfortunate, as it precluded all hope of recovery. Broken health soon succeeded, and obliged him to pass the remaining sixteen years of his life in seclusion, surrounded by children and grandchildren, to whom his beautiful patience and resignation were a daily example ; while his truly capacious mind was a rich storehouse of knowledge ever at their command. Mr. Haughton died at Ramsgate on the 5th April, 1867.

Mr. Haughton was Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, as well as that of France ; of the Anthropological Society ; the Société Royale des Antiquaires du Nord, and other learned bodies. He was brother of the well-known Orientalist, Sir Graves Haughton.

Mr. J. McGRIGOR ALLAN proposed that the thanks of the society be given to Mr. E. W. Brabrook for his obituary notice of the life of Dr. Boudin, and to Mr. Kenneth R. H. Mackenzie for his notice of the life of Dr. Nott.

Mr. CHARLES HARDING seconded the motion ; and it was carried unanimously.

MESSRS. BRABROOK and MACKENZIE severally acknowledged their obligations to the Society for the honour.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Treasurer, the Rev. Dunbar I. Heath, to deliver the Anniversary Address.

Anniversary Address delivered before the Anthropological Society of London, the 14th Jan., 1868. By the Rev. DUNBAR I. HEATH, M.A., Treasurer A.S.L.

GENTLEMEN,—The honourable task has devolved on me of delivering before you the Annual Address on this the fifth anniversary meeting of the Society. Your President, Consul Burton, is, as you are aware, unable to be present to-day, and it is at the request of the other officers of the Society, and with the sanction of the Council, that I now address you, an undertaking which, although I feel it to be honourable, is at the same time of no small difficulty.

It will be my duty to speak to you on the general state of the affairs of the Society, and I shall, in the first place, touch upon those points with which I, as your Treasurer, am specially concerned, viz., the finances of the Society.

It is now five years since the Anthropological Society came into existence. During that time the amount of money which it has expended in printing alone amounts to a sum of no less than £4,000. This sum, you must remember, however, has not been simply spent in printing works for distribution to the Fellows of the Society; but we are, in fact, the actual possessors of a stock of publications on anthropological science, which are being gradually sold to the public. Thus, some of our capital is locked up in these publications, and we could only realise this portion at present, if we wished to do so, at a sacrifice. Although this may be, to some extent, an injury to the Society financially, we have the satisfaction of knowing that these publications have materially assisted to promote the study of our science amongst the general public. The standard works we have published, such as Waitz and Blumenbach, cannot fail eventually to well repay the Society for the outlay upon them.

In the balance sheet of assets and liabilities, we are also unable to say what is our exact financial state, for the additional reason of the number of defaulters on our books. As your Treasurer, I feel it incumbent on me to state that I have advised the Council to take shortly some serious steps in order to reduce this list. A Publishing Society like our own, can only be conducted successfully when all unite loyally to discharge their duties to the Society. The first and foremost of those duties, I venture as your Treasurer to suggest, is that the annual subscription should be promptly paid, and I trust that the defaulters will see that they are impeding the progress of the Society by their delay. The recent financial panic has, no doubt, assisted to increase the defaulters' list, and the Council have not thought it advisable to press the Fellows of the Society for their subscriptions. The time, however, has now arrived when an effort should be made to collect all outstanding debts to the Society. Up to this time the expenditure for one year has been estimated on the income of the preceding year: in future it is proposed to print works for the money actually in hand.

I have dwelt on this point, because I consider, that a great part of the future success of the undertakings of the Society will depend on the state of its finances. In the early history of the Society it was not only allowable, but almost a necessity, that the expenditure should exceed the income. The time has now come, however, when it is thought that we have done enough to show the reality of our intentions as a Printing and Publishing Society, and that for the future we should endeavour to secure for the Society as solid a foundation financially as we have acquired scientifically.

On taking a review of the labours of the Society in the past, it cannot but be a source of gratification to the Fellows to know that at no time in its history, has greater interest been shown in their proceedings than at the present. On previous anniversary meetings we have had to defend ourselves from the attacks which were made upon us from all quarters; now such attacks are rarely heard. Those students of man who wish to combine all the partial studies of man under the one name of anthropology, have for four years had to fight for the

very existence of this name; now we no longer hear the cry "Anthropology is not a science!" The question of to-day is—"What does anthropology teach?" This is the latest and most gratifying sign of our progress. The name of anthropology has been received and adopted by the public at large to signify a science, or series of sciences, not only of interest, but of the most profound importance, to mankind. A perusal of the periodical literature of the day at once reveals to us the fact that the eyes, not only of the scientific world, but of thinking people in general, are simultaneously turned to the investigations of the anthropologist. The attention which was paid to, and the interest felt in, all questions of anthropological science at Dundee, by a people so peculiarly tenacious of early imbibed principles and associations as the Scotch, cannot but be considered as a most gratifying sign of the times. It is also satisfactory to know that the people of Great Britain, whether English, Scotch or Irish, are all feeling something more than a transitional interest in the science of man. They are now becoming alive to the fact that anthropological science is a thing which concerns each man and woman within these realms; that it is, in fact, the anthropologist, by whatever name he now goes, who must be consulted for the future help and guidance in the government of alien races.

Our public and political writers are awaking also to the fact that there are such distinctions as those which have long been pointed out by anthropologists. It is true that attempts are yet frequently made to deny that problems like the Irish question, for instance, are matters of race, but every fact adduced goes to show that such they are. Politicians continue sometimes to act like the ostrich, and by hiding from themselves objectionable facts, ignore their existence; but they will not be able to do this much longer. The views enunciated on this subject by our founder, Dr. James Hunt, and by that distinguished English anthropologist, Dr. John Beddoe, are destined ere long to meet with general, if not universal, acceptance. "We English having attempted to manage and govern a people whose nature and feelings we could not understand, the results have been deplorable:" such was the language used by Dr. Beddoe at the opening of the Manchester Anthropological Society in November, 1866.* Do we understand the Irish any better now? The treasonable conspiracy now known under the name of Fenianism, is little more than the abnormal or diseased expression of long-endured race antagonisms and jealousy. Let it not, however, be supposed that this question of Ireland is to be solved by the anthropologist in his study, any more than by the statesman in his closet. On the contrary, we have yet to learn, not only what are the relative numbers of the different races inhabiting Ireland, but also to acquaint ourselves with all other facts in connection with these races, before we can be in a position to legislate successfully. The same observations hold good in reference to our relations with the indigenous races with whom we come in contact in our conquests or colonisation. The future government of any people can

* "Anthropological Review," vol. v, p. 20.

only be successfully carried on when we know the elements with which we have to deal. The anthropologist no more than the chemist, can predict the effect of the mixture of unknown quantities of different elements. Before a safe step can be made in a right direction towards establishing a lasting and secure basis for the present government of Ireland, we must ascertain what are the relative proportions of which the population is composed.

If it be true that our statesmen do not understand the Irish people, how is it possible that they can hope to govern them with mutual satisfaction? The time, however, is not far distant when it will be both advisable and necessary for our statesmen to know something more than they know now with regard to the races of Ireland and their several special aspirations. It may seem strange to hear it hinted that an Anthropological Commission should, in the first place, be appointed to collect facts with regard to the Irish races! But the races in Ireland are no exceptions to races elsewhere. If modern history have taught us one lesson more plainly than any other, it is that we must first understand a race or people before we can govern it—and why should there be any exception to this law?

If we turn to the continent, we find that the same law prevails. The best legislator or politician is he who best understands the elements he governs; or, in other words, the best practical anthropologist.

It is desirable to take, at the present juncture, a more catholic view of the present tendency of the age, of which Fenianism is but a passing symptom,—that tendency of self-assertion evinced by all races and nationalities. What is now occurring among the Celtic and other races of Ireland, happened years ago in Austria and Russia under similar political circumstances, when the dominant Teutonic race or government tried to rule the autochthonous populations by force, without previously attempting to understand them. Certain concessions have recently been offered to the national prejudices of Poland, Hungary, Bohemia, and others among conquered and subdued peoples, in hopes of better results; but the success of this change of policy remains to be seen.

When we consider such subjects, there is evidently a great field both of labour and usefulness, as I have said, open to the Society. We can as yet only see dimly the real influence which the deductions of the anthropologist will, at a future day, have in the government of the world. Astronomy and geology have already yielded practical results, but the lesson to be learnt from comparative anthropology at least equals either of these in usefulness. The science of anthropology is, however, far more complicated than either astronomy or geology, and opposes so many more prejudices and passions in its study, that the results attained can only gradually obtain general acceptance. As Dr. David Page has recently well remarked, our own Society is but a thing of yesterday. We are, no doubt, still in the infantile stage of our existence. Many of our teachings are as yet only general, and they lack the power of being rigidly demonstrated. But even allowing all the imperfections of our science, we yet feel that we hold the keys to

some of those questions which must remain for ever the most interesting and important.

We must remember that both astronomical and geological science are now receiving very great support from the public funds. We rejoice that such should be the case, for it is the normal progress of all sciences to begin with the inorganic and gradually rise to the organic. Botany and zoology are now receiving the attention of the state. State commissioners are appointed to investigate the laws regulating the history and development of the fishes of the sea. Soon, no doubt, it will extend its aid to investigations into the history and laws of growth with reference to the propagation of the mammalia. At present this question is left to an independent body—the Acclimatisation Society,—but we have no doubt the state will see that this duty essentially belongs to itself. And when this is accomplished, the state may also see that the Science of Man should have at least the same support as is accorded to geology. Associated as this country is with nearly every great division of mankind, it becomes the paramount duty of the state to encourage our science. If the government support a school of mines, why should it not also support a school for the scientific study of mankind?

This question the present generation may see put to the Legislature by eminent scientific men, now, we hope, on the eve of taking a place in Parliament. We have only to go on quietly and zealously with the work before us, and the day will come when we shall find that, although our labours in the cause of truth have been simply and solely for her own sake, yet our deductions will be accepted as the basis of all truly scientific legislation.

The attention of men of science has, during the past year, been much occupied with the very important question of the teaching of Science in our schools and colleges. Having myself gone through the University of Cambridge, I may be permitted to add my testimony to the value of the teaching of physical science as a branch of both elementary and advanced study. There are in the universities still many who would teach science only metaphysically and theologically. Some seem instinctively to dread positive science in any form. With others, on the contrary, there is an active desire to free themselves from the metaphysical stage of science. As a sign of this, I may instance the formation of a Society for the study of Anthropology amongst the undergraduates of the University of Oxford, so remarkable for its theological and mediæval proclivities. The students of our other universities will, no doubt, follow the example thus set them. Such societies deserve, I think, our warmest support and encouragement. Under the present aspect of public affairs, we cannot expect the State to do more than partially assist labourers in the separated departments of anthropology. We must rely on our own independent exertions. If the combination of the departmental sciences we advocate, should become generally accepted amongst the independent thinkers in the rising generation of university men, it will be the means of materially assisting our progress. Such men will come to us with all the vigour of youth, and, with the weapons of

logic, will act as the champions of truth and as lights for the diffusion of knowledge. Let those amongst us who may be inclined to take a desponding view of the difficulties with which our path has been, and still is, beset, take but a view of the state of the Science of Man in this country five years ago, and its condition now, and the result cannot but have the effect of inspiring them with satisfaction for the past, and with both zeal and hope for the future.

And here let me say that the limits fixed for the proper working of our own Society have not yet been nearly reached. After a careful consideration of the plans proposed for working the Society, it was ascertained that they could not be carried out in their totality unless our list of Fellows should number two thousand names ; as yet it has not reached half that number. While some, therefore, are working at the scientific investigation of the different branches of our science, let others exert themselves to increase our numerical strength. There are very many really zealous and earnest Fellows of this Society whose time, talents, and, may be, money, are readily and freely given to promote the noble cause for which the Society was founded. Let others now follow their example.

We, at least, must not be open to the reproach of lukewarmness. Let us show that it is no phantom of the imagination which we are seeking, and that we are not impelled onward by fanatic zeal ; but, at the same time, it behoves us to be, both in public and private, sincere and earnest in what we have undertaken, and to show that we do not leave to the upholders of dogmatic creeds the credit of being alone zealous in their daily life and duties. Science cannot be advanced by diletante investigations, nor by cold and timorous teachers.

We must be emphatic, truthful, and fearless ; and we need not in that case anticipate anything but the ultimate fruition of our hopes—perhaps at a less remote period than it may seem to us now, when still surrounded by dangers and obstacles, which should rather stimulate us to farther exertion and greater zeal.

I will now proceed to call your attention, gentlemen, to a point of the highest importance in the development of our science. “Order,” to employ the words of the poet, “gives all things view ;” and, in anthropology, which embraces such a multiplicity of detail, and requires nothing so much for its progressive character as classification, order is beyond everything of most imperative need. Everything must be to hand—every minute fact, which may, at any moment, prove of vital importance to the whole structure of the science, must be available, as it may, from circumstances, be called to assume a prominent bearing upon new facts. We cannot tell what effect some seemingly inconsiderable circumstance may exercise, what ingenious framework of hypothesis may not be shattered to fragments, and what total reconstruction may be found needful. To encounter new facts with a cheering hope of their leading up to a new scheme of induction, we must be able at the instant to correlate them with all other known facts at our command. The right appreciation of the physical and social existence of man, demands the utmost vigilance and promptitude in applying the novel results of our researches, and a rigid application

of analytical criticism must in all cases precede our new and unexpected synthesis. We have not alone to record, we must be ready to apply the recorded results, careless whither they may conduct us, and with a stern disregard for preconceived ideas—no matter how venerable for antiquity, or hallowed by authority and prescript. Especially are such efforts required in such a single-hearted spirit, when we enter upon the broad, and, as yet, somewhat indistinct field, of what has been somewhat loosely denominated the pre-historic era. Here every item assumes, for most cogent reasons, proportions as to importance, the most gigantic for good or for evil to society at large. These traces raise a question which sooner or later must be answered. What is the limit of history? if by history we mean our knowledge of the period and circumstances of man's existence on the globe. Have we indeed any right to say to the wave of evidence, thus far and no farther, in history, as in other branches of human inquiry?

Of late years, the word "document" has received an extension of meaning for which there is much reason for satisfaction. A rock, a bone, a cranium, now, in scientific conversation, is as much a document as a written parchment or a printed statement. But some have spoken of the "documentary evidence" of pre-historic times. It may be objected that the use of the term archaic as a designation of any part of anthropology, anterior to the division of historical anthropology, implies some idea of a chronology more or less definite, and that the term "pre-historic" renders the same idea, but this is hardly the case. When we speak of pre-historic times, we are necessarily placing ourselves in a dilemma. How can that be pre-historic, of which we have evidence? It is only to circumstances utterly unknown to us in any sense of evidence at all, that we can apply the term "pre-historic"; whereas, when we employ the word "archaic", we cannot but associate it with the rudest efforts of man's civilisation—the designation historic implying a period or a set of circumstances to some degree expressive of a culture more or less polished—surroundings in which the subjective asserts its intellectual rank, and by which thought and its attendant development receives a definite representation. In this way we can justify the application of both terms without offence to the exact literality of either. At all events, the term "pre-historic archæology" is a manifest tautology, and it is most likely that our three or four scientific brethren who at present make some use of the expression, will see that the designation "archaic anthropology" practically comprehends what they desire to convey, and avoids any confusion for the future. The term "palæo-ethnological" is open to the same difficulties, from almost the same reason, as we have at present nothing upon which to found racial distinctions, *per se*, among these very remote traces of man's existence. Is not this a contradiction in terms? Wherever we have documents, have we not history? If so, we must abandon the term pre-historic, or extend the denomination history, and apply it with confidence to a larger area of time. The present age, whether as regards India, China, Egypt, the Greeks, the Scandinavians, and others, is unquestionably in advance of the knowledge possessed at the beginning of the century, without drawing in any

way upon the resources furnished by drifts, explorations, lake-dwellings, kitchen-middens, barrows, tumuli or cave explorations. Yet, though what has been exclusively called *History* is dumb, the *facts* will speak on appeal, and a vast and yet partially unexplored field is the reward of those, who, in view of possible modifications of our knowledge, suspended their judgment. These facts even introduce us to a sort of chronology, and that brings us to the necessity of a stern scientific classification of man and his surroundings.

Even the wildest dreams of the most daring theorists cannot at present compass the origines of mankind, and it is a duty of the most urgent necessity to proclaim such a truth to all who desire to know rather than to believe, to understand rather than to submit in unhesitating acquiescence. The law of England having justly and wisely limited the memory of man to a definite period, that of the age of Richard the First, we, as students, not only of man, but of Nature, may, without shame, confess our inability to chronometrically limit the period of his being, and claim an exemption from the arbitrary imposition of a short fixed era for the duration and development of man's existence. By this means alone can we arrive at the threshold of the important inquiry into the earliest history revealed to us by recent discoveries. Some may think the time to be accepted as being of a most appalling character; but in the end it is our true guard against future error, and the loyal acceptance of the stupendous truths disclosed to us, is a moral necessity.

Any longer to palter with these facts is to place ourselves under the supremacy of the quite baseless traditions of the former barbarous inhabitants of Syria. As Anthropologists, especially, this duty of emancipation becomes pre-eminent; and while we frankly admit a period for man's existence to which we can assign nothing but that of the post-tertiary formations in geology, we consolidate and verify our position as men of science. I am here on the verge, therefore, of anthropological classification. Prehistoric times do not exist in reality; the idea conveyed is too vague, and the terminology does not fit our position, and when we survey the great branch of our science which has been called Archaic Anthropology, we find an excuse and a justification in the nature of the inquiry before us. There is much to satisfy the theorist, more to content the logician, most to impel the honest lover of truth for truth's sake, in the sincere adoption of, as it were, a boundless past for the investigation of man's earliest social and physical development. What the lake-dwellings give to us is far from unhistorical; the facts already ascertained point to a civilisation, however remote, analogous to that presented in later days, and the contemplation of them leads to deductions as to the future, equally weighty, equally breathing a spirit of progress for mankind in its infinite varieties and multiple forms. We are enabled to look this dead civilisation in the face with a firm confidence in the future of mankind; though empires have risen and fallen—though vast systems of society have taken root and spread, and then become engulfed in the reaction of barbarism, Man remains a cardinal fact in evidence of his invariable tendency to progress and to improvement. No tradition can here serve us, no

dogma confine us. We perceive the same irresistible impulses working in that clear past, that surround us on every hand now. Rudimentary as the science of that long past period may appear to us, it was the culmination of man's efforts then—the evidence of his strivings after a more orderly condition.

The farther we penetrate the earth's crust, the more cumulative is the evidence of the immense antiquity of the races of mankind, and the less do we feel disposed to adhere to the standards of tradition. Archaic Anthropology, the latest born of the great departments of our science, is destined probably to work the most beneficent change in our views of Man's being on this planet. Practically it must enlarge the minds of those to whom it is a source of interest and wonder, and tend to remove the acerbities forced upon the intellectual state of modern thought, by time-honoured assumption and venerable ignorance. By so doing will it not confer a great practical good upon society in every one of its ramifications?

The domain of Historical Anthropology, specifically so called, next claims our attention. Throughout the whole of man's career, the formation of language, the accretion of traditionary creeds, and the gradual development of systems of mythology take place, and it is of the highest importance that an adequate collection of facts of this class should co-exist with the investigation of Archaic Anthropology. There is a natural sequence in the arrangement assigning the second place in our science to Historical Anthropology: just as the former displays Man in the earliest times yet known, building up a physical economy, so this department illustrates the corresponding intellectual out-births of man's earliest views of the universe around him, and his relation to it. It forms a record of his earliest knowledge and beliefs concerning his history as a thinking being, and presents a solid substratum upon which to build Descriptive Anthropology, its natural issue. Notwithstanding the splendid results popularised to us by Max Müller in this department, the work still remaining is overwhelming. It is not only necessary to accumulate the evidence, but the subsequent process of correlation has to be entered on, if we are at any time to look forward to the vivid restoration of these remote ages. I can therefore only recommend, with great emphasis, the necessity for a comprehensive investigation into this series of evidence; from it, and it alone, can we hope for a reconstruction of early beliefs, and an intelligible idea of the interior life of early times. Intimately associated with the various forms of creed is the subject of superstition, magic, star and tree-worship, and charms, and a wide section of human thought is thus laid open to us. The origin of poetry, music, painting, and the finer arts of life, together with the literary development of early ages, appertains also to this division of our science. The birth of hieroglyphic and alphabetic writing is likewise to be placed here. The agglomeration of laws and the remote foundation of forms of government next succeed, and thus link Historical Anthropology with the science of Descriptive Anthropology, which properly forms the next stage of inquiry. Nothing displays the necessity for a formal study of mankind and its peculiarities, so much as this last.

Descriptive Anthropology is at no loss for materials ; every continent, island, and rock, abounds in races of men more or less interesting to the student of anthropological science. Into this sphere enter manners and customs, observances, manufactures, domestic habits, and the gradual introduction of peculiarities in dress and new forms of aliment. With the rise of the arts, ensues the necessity of commerce and the intermixture of alien races ; and here, in turn, Descriptive Anthropology gives place to the phenomena of Comparative Anthropology.

The consideration of hybridity (in a monogenistic sense), of the intermixture of races and their effects upon race character, insensibly conducts to that of man's animal nature as displayed on the globe at the present day, preparing the way for the craniologist, the osteologist, the anatomist, and the physiologist, and pointing to an ultimate practical application of all previously ascertained physical and social truths, in which the efforts of scientific men culminate and are completed. Here the proportions of anthropological science assume a magnitude and a value of inestimable service to the statesman and the ruler in whatsoever capacity his function of rule may be exercised. The family and the nation alike profit by the studies of the comparative anthropologist, and the mysterious link between mind and matter—in other words, between structure and function—receives illustration and interpretation at his hands. Thus and thus only, can Anthropology, the noblest of the sciences, receive the general approbation of mankind. It is by displaying the practical influence of our deductions that we can avert national calamities, explain oriental and occidental civilisations, and neutralise the effects of race-antagonism with its train of errors and mistakes. Here we become the companions of the philanthropist, the councillors of the statesman, the guides of the physician, and the interpreters of man's interior nature. To rightly merit this proud pre-eminence, all our efforts are needed, all our party feelings must be buried, all our favourite theories subjected to the touchstone of consistency, induction, and scientific criticism. It is not enough to proclaim generalities, but we must also descend into particulars. It will not suffice to raise a stately framework, the lacunæ must be supplied, the differences accommodated, and the inconsistencies—apparent rather than real—contrasted, and finally consigned to their true station. By a skilful and cordial co-operation, in such manner, can we ultimately hope for a universal recognition of the necessity of anthropological science throughout the civilised world.

There is one personal duty which I have to perform with mingled feelings of pride and sorrow. We have lost from the ranks of science four eminent men who in various ways and countries have striven for anthropology : you have heard memorial statements made this day respecting three of them, and at a later period we may anticipate to hear more of the important labours of Sir William Lawrence.

Finally, we have to rejoice that one great fact has happened. Two years ago, our President made an appeal to you and to the government to assist in rescuing our colleague, Consul Cameron, from the clutches of the Christian barbarian who rules over the races of

Abyssinia. You, no doubt, remember that a Fellow of our Society, Dr. Jules Blanc, went to try to procure the release of our colleague, and himself became a prisoner. We have at last to rejoice that a vigorous attempt is being made by the government to save our two Fellows and their companions from the doom which awaited them.

After thus congratulating the Society, allow me, in concluding this necessarily brief and fragmentary address, to express a hope that each Fellow of this Society will address himself seriously to the presentation of facts in one or other of these sections of our science, and that it should be considered most important to contribute in ever so small a degree to the stores of our general knowledge. It would be idle to attempt to conceal from ourselves the fact that the name of anthropology has met, and has yet to encounter, the bitter hostility of very large and influential classes of society. To avert our eyes from this fact would be foolish; to stem the tide of opposition, calumny, and ridicule, we require only determination and perseverance, and to know our own minds. Our science depends, for its triumph in its character of a combination of other practical sciences, upon the efforts of individuals, and we must be prepared to encounter opposition while we are compelled to the task of clearing away the accretion of rubbish and misrepresentation which ages have unfortunately accumulated. But we must not fail in loyalty to ourselves, and we are sure of success. With steadfast confidence in the good faith of our researches, we may show an undaunted front to our opponents:—

“Stand we calm and resolute,
Like a forest close and mute,
With folded arms, and looks which are
Weapons of an unvanquished war.”

Shelley, “Masque of Anarchy.”

This, in conclusion, I am bound to say; during our short existence much has been done to show how vast is the field before us; much has been accomplished towards the establishment of method and order in our ranks, and to those who have worked early and late for the realisation of a portion of our science, our thanks are due. Let us not, gentlemen, be ungrateful to the eminent men abroad and at home who have so enlarged the sphere of our knowledge, but by a subdivision of labour, emulate their example.

For myself, I thank you for the attention with which you have honoured me. I shall ever seek to act upon the recommendations I have ventured to make, so that my preaching may be illustrated by my practice.

A unanimous vote of thanks was given to the Treasurer for his address.

The TREASURER briefly returned thanks.

Mr. A. C. BREBNER moved that the thanks of the Society be given to the retiring members of the Council, Colonel Lane Fox and Mr. Hotze, for their services during the past year.

Mr. BRABROOK having seconded the resolution, it was unanimously carried.